

### **Remarks**

The applicants have carefully considered the Office action dated April 27, 2007 and the references it cites. By way of this Response, claims 1, 15, and 28 have been amended. In view of the following, it is respectfully submitted that all pending claims are in condition for allowance and favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 2, 4-11, 15, 28 and 29 are pending in the application with claims 1, 15 and 28 being independent. All of these independent claims were rejected in the Final Office Action from the parent to this RCE as anticipated by Allen, U.S. Patent, 5,899,303. These independent claims are amended herein to further clarify the distinction over Allen already believed present in the claims as previously presented.


### **Examiner Interview and the Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102**

In a telephone interview with Examiner Redman on the 23<sup>rd</sup> of October, it was pointed out that the Final Office Action makes reference to Allen having sealing surfaces that are orthogonal to the surface of the door panel. Specifically, in paragraph 1 of the action, it states “each surface of the seal extends from a “mounting surface” (108a, 108b) of the door is orthogonal thereto”. (emphasis added). Similarly, in response to the applicant’s arguments, the action states “Allen discloses having a plurality of sealing surfaces in which they are “orthogonal” to and defined by the plane of the surface of the door panel.” (emphasis added). Continuing with the interview, it was then pointed out that applicant was not claiming sealing surfaces orthogonal to the surface of the door panel as addressed in the action, but rather that applicant was claiming something quite different – namely that the sealing surface in question (the first sealing surface) was

oriented such that a ray drawn orthogonal to the plane of that sealing surface would intersect the surface of the door panel. Indeed, the geometry being claimed by the applicants is mutually exclusive from the Allen sealing surfaces that are orthogonal to the surface of the door panel. In this regard, reference is made to the drawing from Allen reproduced in the Office Action of 20 January 06 (see below). In that drawing, the left-hand face of the seal 126 is one of the sealing surfaces that the instant Action refers to as extending orthogonally from the surface of the door panel. A ray drawn orthogonally to that planar surface, however, would never intersect the door panel since such a ray would be parallel to the door surface (by virtue of the seal face being orthogonal/perpendicular thereto). The claimed concept, then, of a first planar sealing surface oriented such that a ray extending orthogonally thereto intersects the plane of the panel clearly distinguishes over (and is mutually exclusive from) the structure of Allen.

Even so, the Examiner was of the opinion that the claims as they stood did not clearly identify the surface of the first seal being claimed as having that feature. Without acceding to the Examiner's opinion in this regard, applicant's have nonetheless amended the claims (primarily by moving existing text) to make clearer that the surface in question is the surface on the first seal that contacts the second seal when the door panel is in the doorway blocking position. When those seals are in contact, a ray drawn orthogonally from the first sealing surface intersects the surface of the door panel. Returning again to the reproduced drawing from Allen, the language of the amendment clearly identifies the left face of the seal 126 as corresponding to the first sealing surface of the claim (since it is the surface of the first seal that contacts the second seal when the door is in the doorway blocking position). As detailed above, this surface does not read on the

amended claims, since a ray drawn orthogonal to the left face of member 126 would be parallel (i.e. NOT intersect) the surface of the door panel. Since this clarifying amendment has been made to all of the outstanding independent claims (all rejected as anticipated by Allen), it is submitted that the application is now in condition for allowance.



Given the allowability of the independent claims as explained above, the dependent claims are likewise allowable.

### Conclusion

Reconsideration of the application and allowance thereof are respectfully requested. If there is any matter that the examiner would like to discuss, the examiner is invited to contact the undersigned representative at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,  
Hanley, Flight & Zimmerman, LLC  
150 South Wacker Drive  
Suite 2100  
Chicago, Illinois 60606

Dated: **October 29, 2007**

/James A. Flight/

James A. Flight  
Registration No. 37,622  
Attorney for Applicant  
(312) 580-1020